



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,583	10/23/2003	Viswanath Krishnamurthy	843161-317	1089

7590

03/15/2006

B Noel Kivlin  
MEYERTONS HOOD KIVLIN KOWERT & GOETZEL P. C.  
P O BOX 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

FRANKLIN, RICHARD B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2181

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/693,583	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KRISHNAMURTHY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Richard Franklin	<b>Art Unit</b> 2181	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8 and 10-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8 and 10-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) **GROUP 2100**  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 44281 3/13/2006
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Fritz Fleming*  
**FRITZ FLEMING**  
Supervisory PRIMARY EXAMINER

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 2, 4 – 8, and 10 – 19 have been examined.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Larson (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033393) is cited to fix the deficiencies of Sakai (US Patent No. 5,581,787) in regards to unamended claim 16. Also, Larson is used to teach the newly added limitations of amended claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 – 2, 4 – 8, 10 – 11, 13 – 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyr et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0177211 (hereinafter Cyr) in view of Larson et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033393 (hereinafter Larson).

As per claim 1, Cyr teaches a computer network system (Cyr; Figure 2 Item 50), comprising: a circuit board forming a backplane (Cyr; Figure 3 Item 104, Paragraph [0029] Lines 5 – 9); at least one field replaceable unit (FRU) slot located on the

backplane (Cyr; Figure 3 Items 106 – 112, Paragraph [0029] Lines 5 – 9); a bus (Cyr; Figure 2 Item 58, Paragraph [0022] Lines 7 – 10); a central resource (Cyr; Figure 2 Items 52 – 56) coupled with the FRU slot via the bus, wherein the central resource is configured to generate a client-ID, wherein the client-ID is associated with the FRU slot (Cyr; Paragraph [0025] Lines 17 – 19); a non-volatile memory (Cyr; Figure 2 Item 92) coupled to the central resource, wherein the client-ID is stored in the non-volatile memory (Cyr; Paragraph [0025] Lines 17 – 25).

Cyr does not teach wherein when an FRU is connected to the FRU slot, the central resource is configured to retrieve the client-ID and provide the client-ID to the FRU, wherein the FRU is configured to download the client-ID via the bus.

However, Larson teaches a computer network system wherein when an FRU (Larson; Figure 3 Item 300) is connected to the FRU slot (Larson; Figures 1 and 2 Item 110), the central resource (Larson; Figure 3 Item 300E) is configured to retrieve the client-ID and provide the client-ID to the FRU, wherein the FRU is configured to download the client-ID via the bus (Larson; Paragraph [0070] Lines 11 – 15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Cyr by those of Larson because downloading the client-ID to the FRU is important because what was once a unique address in the system may conflict with an address in another system if the FRU is moved to the other system (Larson; Paragraph [0070] Lines 18 – 24).

As per claim 2, Cyr also teaches wherein the FRU slot comprises a Compact Peripheral Component Interconnect (CPCI) slot (Cyr; Paragraph [0028] Lines 6 – 11).

As per claim 4, Cyr also teaches wherein the client-ID comprises a geographical address of said FRU slot (Cyr; Figure 4 Item 200, Paragraph [0031]).

As per claim 5, Cyr also teaches wherein the client-ID comprises a unique identifier and wherein the unique identifier prevents an FRU from clashing with other network devices (Cyr; Paragraph [0022] Lines 12 – 14).

As per claim 6, Cyr also teaches wherein the client-ID comprises a client-ID utilized by an address protocol for assigning dynamic Internet Protocol (IP) addresses (Cyr; Paragraph [0024]).

As per claim 7, Cyr also teaches wherein said address protocol comprises a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) (Cyr; Paragraph [0024]).

As per claim 8, Cyr also teaches wherein the system further comprises an FRU held by said FRU slot (Cyr; Paragraph [25] Lines 8 – 14, and Paragraph [0028] Lines 10 – 13).

As per claim 10, Larson also teaches wherein said client-ID can be downloaded by said FRU via said bus (Larson; Paragraph [0070] Lines 11 – 15).

As per claim 11, Larson also teaches wherein the FRU uses an Intelligent Platform Management Interface (IPMI) protocol to download the client-ID (Larson; Paragraph [0070] Lines 3 – 7).

As per claims 13 and 19, Cyr also teaches determining whether said FRU is to be replaced by a new FRU (Cyr; Paragraph [0025] Lines 8 – 14); retrieving and making said client-ID available to said new FRU (Larson; Paragraph [0062] Lines 7 – 9); and downloading said client-id by said new FRU (Larson; Paragraph [0062] Lines 7 – 9).

As per claim 14, Cyr also teaches the computer network system further comprising a second FRU slot located on said backplane and wherein said central resource generates a second client-ID (Cyr; Figure 2, Paragraph [0022] Lines 10 – 24).

As per claim 15, Cyr also teaches wherein said client-ID is uniquely generated by said central resource for said FRU slot and said second client-ID is uniquely generated by said central resource for said second FRU slot (Cyr; Paragraph [0022] Lines 10 – 24).

As per claim 16, Cyr teaches a method for client-ID generation on a computer network system (Cyr; Figure 2 Item 50), comprising: generating a client-ID via a central resource (Cyr; Paragraph [0025] Lines 17 – 19); associating the client-ID with a field replaceable unit (FRU) slot (Cyr; Paragraph [0022] Lines 7 – 24); storing the associated client-ID in a non-volatile memory (Cyr; Figure 2 Item 92; Paragraph [0025] Lines 17 – 25).

Cyr does not teach providing the stored client-ID to an FRU via an interface; and utilizing the client-ID by the FRU.

However, Larson teaches a computer network system wherein when an FRU is connected to the FRU slot, the central resource (Larson; Figure 3 Item 300E) is configured provide the client-ID to the FRU, and the client-ID is used by the FRU (Larson; Paragraph [0070]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Cyr by those of Larson because downloading the client-ID to the FRU is important because what was once a unique address in the system may conflict with an address in another system if the FRU is moved to the other system (Larson; Paragraph [0070] Lines 18 – 24).

As per claim 17, Cyr also teaches wherein the FRU is inserted into the FRU slot associated with the client-ID (Cyr; Paragraph [0029]).

Art Unit: 2181

4. Claims 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyr et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0177211 (hereinafter Cyr) in view of Larson et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033393 (hereinafter Larson) as applied to claims 1 – 2, 4 – 8, 10 – 11, 13 – 17, and 19 above and further in view of Reichmeyer et al. US Patent No. 6,286,038 (hereinafter Reichmeyer).

As per claims 12 and 18, Cyr in view of Larson teach the system as described above.

Cyr in view of Larson does not teach wherein the FRU utilizes the client-ID for Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) booting.

However, Reichmeyer teaches a client (Reichmeyer; Figure 1 Item 10) who utilizes DHCP booting in a network system (Reichmeyer; Figure 1 Item 18, Col 4 Lines 4 – 20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Cyr in combination with Larson because DHCP booting allows the client to choose a DHCP server to utilize (Reichmeyer; Col 4 Lines 4 – 30).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Franklin whose telephone number is (571) 272-0669. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.



Art Unit: 2181

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fritz Fleming can be reached on (571) 272-4145. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Richard Franklin  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2181

*Fritz Fleming*  
Supervisory  
FRITZ FLEMING  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2100  
Art 2181  
3/13/2008